A/A

In the United States District Court In The Northern District of Okiahoma JUL 12014

U.S. DISTRICT COLLER

Linksey Hent Springer, Movent,

V.

Case No. 13-CU-145 (Formerly 09-CR-043)

United States of America

Respondent.

Declaration of Lindsey Kent Springer in Support of Motion For Release Pending Disposition of 22550

I, Lindsey Kent Springer, declare the following:

Attacked to this declaration is page 20 of
the hearing Transcript dated october 21, 2009, as

Exhibit AA.

Attacked to this declaration is page 150 of the hearing Transcript dated July 2, 2009, as Exhibit BB.

Attacked to this declaration are pages 2899; 2900, 2906, 2907, 2910, and 2913, of the Trial Transcript dated November 12, 2009, as a group Exhibit CC.

 November 13, 2009, as a group Exhibit DD. Thave been incorrected since April 23, 2010.

I have served more than 50 months having only lost I day of good time, at present,

I file this declaration in Support of my Motion For Release pending disposition of my 2255.

Based upon 60 month maximum and having to serve 87°10 equals 52 months and 6 days of the 600 months.

I have served so months and 9 days minus 1-day equals so months 8-days.

Based upon the errors shown in my Motion. I should be in a halfway house at present. if my arguments are correct

I declare under penalty of perjury, pursuant to 28 USC. 3 1746(1), under the laws of the united States of America, the above is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

declarant/
Reg # 02580-063
Federal Satellie Low-Lating
P.O. Box 6000
Anthony, New Mexico 88021

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that on July &, 2014, I mailed First Class U.S Mail the above Declaration and Exhibits to the Clerk of Court, 333 West Fourth St., Tulsa, oklahona 74103!

I further certify all Porties are registered ECF users and shall receive service through the ECF System;

Donny C. Williams Sr. Jeffrey A ballent Charles A. O'Reilly

Server Springs

Declaration of Mading

I declare under the penalty of perjury,
pursuent to 18 U.S.C. \$ 1746(1), under the laws
of the United States of America, that on
July &, 2014, I deposited the above
Declaration and Exhibits in the U.S.
Mailbox located inside FSL Latura.

Sindseyt Josuges

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the government. One matter that is certainly on my agenda for the pretrial conference, but perhaps we ought to address it now, is whether we need -- are going to need a James hearing and -- to determine the admissibility of co-conspirator hearsay.

Obviously, we've got a -- we've got a conspiracy count, for lack of a better word. The conspiracy count, at least from an evidentiary standpoint, may be the grand jury's flagship count in this case. It certainly stakes out the scope, to a large degree, the scope of the evidence that will be admissible. And will apparently be a good deal of evidence come in under the conspiracy count that will be relevant, or is made relevant, by the conspiracy counts that will also be supportive of some of the other counts. But all that comes back to a question of whether we ought to have a hearing, commonly called a James hearing, to determine the existence, at least as to whether there is an adequate preliminary "showing of the existence and scope of a conspiracy.

Obviously, we've got ample case law that counsels a district court to do just exactly that and to have that sort of a hearing if it should appear that the government, to any significant degree, does depend on admissibility of co-conspirator, what would otherwise be hearsay, co-conspirator statements. And I intend to take

Tracy Washbourne, RDR, CRR
United States Court Reporter
U.S. Courthouse, 200 N.W. 4th St.
Oklahoma City, OK 73102 * 405.609.5505

Exhibit AA

who within -- which specific officers or employees were specifically impeded. If there is any exculpatory material where people were not, we're going to be turning that over. I really have no other way to respond to this motion.

THE COURT: Thank you. The motions at Docket Entry Number 63, joined in -- or the motion I should say at Docket Entry Number 63, joined in by Defendant Stilley at Docket Entry Number 69, will be denied.

One thing that was reasonably clear to me, even before today, it certainly is more clear now, is that the charge we have in Count 1 is what is commonly called a Klein conspiracy under the defraud clause of Section 371. This traces back to the Second Circuit's decision in United States v. Klein, 247 F.2d 908.

In that case, the Second Circuit observed that in Hammerschmidt v. United States, 265 U.S. 182, the Supreme Court recognized that the defraud clause reaches not only a conspiracy to cheat the government out of property or money, but that it also reaches conspiracy meant to interfere with or obstruct one of the government's lawful functions. In this case, such as collecting taxes and getting lawful returns in by some means that is dishonest. And that is exactly what is charged here.

Tracy Washbourne, RDR, CRR
United States Court Reporter
U.S. Courthouse, 200 N.W. 4th St.
Oklahoma City, OK 73102 * 405.609.5505

I have obviously given the defendants some relief by

```
will use to express your verdicts separately as to each
1
   of the two defendants. Your verdict as to any one
2
   defendant or count, whether it is guilty or not guilty,
3
   should not influence your verdict as to the other
4
   defendant or any other counts.
5
        Intent ordinarily may not be proved directly.
6
   Because there is no way of fathoming or scrutinizing the
   operations of the human mind. You may infer a
8
   defendants' intent from the surrounding circumstances.
   Intent may be and usually is proved by circumstantial
10
   evidence, if it is proved at all.
11
   You may consider any statements made and any acts
12
   done or omitted by a defendant and all other facts and
13
   circumstances in evidence that indicate his state of
14
          You may consider it reasonable to draw an
15
   inference and thus find that a person intends the natural
16
   consequences of acts knowingly done.
                                          As I have stated,
17
   it is entirely up to you to decide what facts to find
18
   from the evidence.
19
        Knowingly. When the word "knowingly" is used in
20
   these instructions, it means that the act was done
21
```

Knowingly. When the word "knowingly" is used in these instructions, it means that the act was done voluntarily and intentionally and not because of mistake or accident.

22

23

24

25

Willfully. For purposes of these instructions, an act is done willfully if it is done voluntarily and

Tracy Washbourne, RDR, CRR
United States Court Reporter
U.S. Courthouse, 200 N.W. 4th St.
Oklahoma City, OK 73102 * 405.609.5505

Exhibit CC

intentionally and if it is done with the purpose of violating a known legal duty.

Willfulness requires the government to prove that the law imposed a duty on the defendant, that the defendant knew of this duty, and that the defendant voluntarily and intentionally violated this duty.

Good faith defense. In this case, the defendants maintain they are not guilty of any of the crimes charged because they contend they did not act willfully and acted in good faith.

You are instructed that if a defendant had a good faith misunderstanding of the law's requirements to report the income at issue here, he is not guilty of willfully violating a known legal duty. You are further instructed, however, a defendants' disagreement with the law, no matter how earnestly held, does not constitute a defense of good faith, misunderstanding, or mistake. It is the duty of all citizens to obey the law regardless of whether they agree with it.

In determining whether or not a defendant acted willfully and in determining whether a defendant acted in good faith, you may consider all of the circumstances surrounding the transactions and activities which you find occurred. To the extent that you are called upon to evaluate the state of mind of the parties to various

Tracy Washbourne, RDR, CRR
United States Court Reporter
U.S. Courthouse, 200 N.W. 4th St.
Oklahoma City, OK 73102 * 405.609.5505

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

As I stated, Defendants Springer and Stilley are charged in Count 1 with a violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 371. This law makes it a crime to willfully conspire to violate the law by defrauding the United States. The indictment charges that beginning in or about 2000 and continuing until on or about January 15, 2009, within the Northern District of Oklahoma, and elsewhere, Defendants Springer and Stilley and others unlawfully and knowingly combined, conspired, confederated, and agreed together to defraud the United States by impeding, impairing, obstructing, and defeating the lawful government functions of the Internal Revenue Service, an agency of the United States, in the ascertainment, computation, assessment, and collection of revenue, that is federal individual income taxes. Section 371 of 18 United States Code makes it a crime to willfully conspire to violate the law by defrauding the United States. To find a defendant guilty of this crime as charged in Count 1, you must be convinced that the government has proved each of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt: that the defendant agreed with at least one other person to violate the law by defrauding the United States; ... second, that one of the conspirators engaged in at least one overt act furthering the conspiracy's objective;

25'

third, that the defendant knew the essential objective of the conspiracy; fourth, that the defendant participated in the conspiracy knowingly, willfully, and voluntarily; and, fifth, that there was interdependence among the members of the conspiracy. That is that the members of the conspiracy in some way or manner intended to act together for their shared mutual benefit within the scope of the conspiracy charged.

You are further instructed that to "defraud" the United States means not only to intentionally cheat the government out of property or money but also to interfere with or obstruct by deceit, craft, or trickery or at least by means that are dishonest one of the following lawful government functions: The lawful government functions which the indictment charges were interfered with by the defendants in this case are the Internal Revenue Service's ascertainment, computation, assessment, and collection of revenue.

To find a defendant guilty of a conspiracy to defraud the United States, the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant knowingly and willfully acted in the manner set forth in the preceding paragraph. In order to find a defendant guilty of a conspiracy to defraud the United States, the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the

THE COURT: Very well. You've heard me read those paragraphs one time already and they are there for you to see on pages 35, 36, and down to the middle of 37 of the instructions and you should regard those as having been re-read by me. But with the courtesy of counsel and the parties, I will not read them again.

Finally, you are instructed that in addition to the elements described in this instruction, proof of proper venue is also required before you may find a defendant guilty of the crime charged in Count 1. I will instruct you later regarding proof of venue.

Next, I will instruct you regarding Counts 2 through 4 of the indictment. Counts 2, 3, and 4 charge a violation of Section 7201 of Title 26 of the United States Code. Section 7201 provides in pertinent part that "any person who willfully attempts in any manner to evade or defeat any tax imposed by this title or the payment thereof" shall be guilty of an offense against the United States.

Defendant Springer is charged in Count 2 with a violation of this law, Title 26 of the United States

Code, Section 7201. This law makes it a crime for anyone to willfully attempt to evade or defeat the payment of federal income tax. The indictment charges that from on or about January 1, 2000, and continuing to on or about

elements described in this instruction proof of proper venue is also required before you may find the defendant guilty of the crime charged in Count 2. I will instruct you later regarding proof of venue.

Counts 2 and 3, nature of the offense. And for the benefit of the jury, since it's five o'clock, I'm going to go through page 44 and then we'll recess overnight. It won't take terribly long to finish this in the morning.

MR. O'REILLY: Your Honor, I believe you

MR. O'REILLY: Your Honor, I believe you misspoke. Counts 3 and 4.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. The instruction that's on page 42 relates to Counts 3 and 4. And if I said otherwise, that was incorrect.

So members of the jury, I'm going to go through page 44 and then tomorrow morning I will finish with the remainder of the instructions, which won't take terribly long, but I don't intend to keep you tonight while I finish that, and then we will proceed, as I have stated, with the closing arguments of counsel and the parties.

Counts 3 and 4 of the indictment charge both
Defendant Springer and Defendant Stilley with tax evasion
in violation of Title 26, Section 7201, of the United
States Code. As previously stated, this law makes it a
crime to willfully attempt to evade or defeat the payment

guilty of the crime of tax evasion as charged in Count 2, 1 you must be convinced that the government has proved each 2 of the following essential elements beyond a reasonable 3 4 doubt: 5 First, that Defendant Springer owed substantial income tax for the year 2000. 6 Second, that Defendant Springer intended to evade 7 8 and defeat payment of that tax. 9 Third, that Defendant Springer committed an 10 affirmative act in furtherance of this intent. 11 And, fourth, that Defendant Springer acted 12 willfully, that is, with the voluntary intent to violate 13 a known legal duty. To "evade and defeat" the payment of tax means to 14 15 escape paying a tax due other than by lawful avoidance, 16 for the proof need not show the exact amount of the 17 additional tax due; however, the government is required to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the additional 18 19 tax due from Defendant Springer was substantial. 20 And by the way, the presence of the word 21 "additional" in those two sentences is also an error on 22 my part. You are instructed that an affirmative act to evade 23 and defeat payment of taxes is a positive act of 24 25 commission designed to mislead or conceal.

For purposes of Count 2, the affirmative acts alleged in the indictment to have been committed by Defendant Springer are: Receiving income in a fictitious name; directing individuals to write "donation" or "gift" on checks that were payment for services; directing individuals to pay for services by cashier's check; using a check-cashing business to cash checks; using money orders, cash, and other means to avoid creating the usual records of financial transactions and to conceal Defendant Springer's income; making false statements to agents and employees of the Internal Revenue Service; or otherwise concealing and attempting to conceal from all proper officers of the United States of America Defendant Springer's true and correct income.

Finally, you are instructed that in addition to the elements described in this instruction, proof of proper venue is also required before you may find the defendant guilty of the crime charged in Count 2. I will instruct you later regarding proof of venue.

Counts 3 and 4 of the indictment charge both

Defendant Springer and Defendant Stilley with tax

evasion, in violation of Title 26, Section 7201, of the

United States Code.

As previously stated, this law makes it a crime to willfully attempt to evade or defeat the payment of

Tracy Washbourne, RDR, CRR
United States Court Reporter
U.S. Courthouse, 200 N.W. 4th St.
Oklahoma City, OK 73102 * 405.609.5505

federal income tax.

In Count 3, the indictment charges that from on or about January 1, 2003, and continuing to on or about January 15, 2009, within the Northern District of Oklahoma and elsewhere, Defendant Springer had and received taxable income and upon that taxable income there was a substantial income tax due and owing.

The indictment further charges that well-knowing and believing the foregoing facts, Defendants Springer and Stilley did willfully attempt to evade and defeat the individual income taxes due and owing by Defendant Springer to the United States of America for calendar year 2003 by failing to file a United States Individual Income Tax Return, as required by law, and by committing various affirmative acts of evasion.

In Count 4, the indictment charges that from on or about January 1, 2005, and continuing to on or about January 15, 2009, within the Northern District of Oklahoma and elsewhere, Defendant Springer had and received taxable income and upon that taxable income there was a substantial income tax due and owing.

The indictment further alleges that well-knowing and believing the foregoing facts, Defendants Springer and Stilley did willfully attempt to evade and defeat the individual income taxes due and owing by Defendant

Springer to the United States of America for calendar 1 year 2005 by failing to file a United States Individual 2 Income Tax Return, as required by law, and by committing 3 various affirmative acts of evasion. 4 5 Count 3, to find a defendant guilty of the crime of tax evasion, as charged in Count 3, you must be convinced 6 7 that the government has proved each of the following 8 elements beyond a reasonable doubt: 9 First, that Defendant Springer owed substantial income tax for the year 2003; 10 Second, that the defendant intended to evade and 11 defeat payment of that tax owed by Defendant Springer; 12 13 Third, that in furtherance of this intent, the defendant committed one of the affirmative acts charged 14 15 in the indictment: And, fourth, that the defendant acted willfully, 16 that is, with the voluntary intent to violate a known 17 18 legal duty. As previously stated, to evade and defeat the 19 payment of tax means to escape paying a tax due other 20 21 than by lawful avoidance. Count 3 of the indictment does not allege a specific 22 amount of tax due from Defendant Springer from calendar 23 24 The proof need not show the exact amount of year 2003. 25 the tax due for that year.

1.2

And in the official copy, I will delete the word "additional."

The government is required to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the tax due was substantial.

An affirmative act to evade or defeat the payment of taxes is a positive act of commission designed to mislead or conceal.

For purposes of Count 3, the affirmative acts charged in the indictment to have been committed by Defendant Springer are: Directing individuals to make checks payable to Bondage Breakers Ministry; using a check-cashing business to cash checks; and accepting collectable coins as payment for services.

The affirmative acts charged in the indictment by
Defendants Springer and Stilley are: Using Defendant
Stilley's IOLTA account; using Defendant Stilley's credit
card to pay Defendant Springer's personal expenses; using
cashier's checks, money orders, cash, and other means to
avoid creating the usual records of financial
transactions and to conceal income; making false
statements to agents and employees of the Internal
Revenue Service; and otherwise concealing and attempting
to conceal from all proper officers of the United States
of America Defendant Springer's true and correct income.

In addition to being charged as a principal,

Defendant Stilley is charged as an aider and abetter in 1 2 Count 3. I will instruct you shortly regarding the 3 elements of aiding and abetting. 4 Finally, you are instructed that, in addition to the 5 other elements described in this instruction, proof of 6 proper venue is also required before you may find a 7 defendant guilty of the crime charged in Count 3. 8 instruct you later regarding proof of venue. 9 Count 4. To find a defendant guilty of the crime of 10 tax evasion as charged in Count 4, you must be convinced 11 that the government has proved each of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt: 12 13 First, that Defendant Springer owed substantial 14 income tax for the year 2005; 15 Second, that the defendant intended to evade and 16 defeat payment of that tax owed by Defendant Springer; Third, that in furtherance of this intent, the 17 defendant committed one of the affirmative acts charged 18 19 in the indictment; 2.0 And, fourth, that the defendant acted willfully, 21 that is, with the voluntary intent to violate a known 22 legal duty. 23 Again, as previously stated, to evade and defeat the payment of taxes means to escape paying a tax due other 24 25 than by lawful avoidance.

Count 4 of the indictment does not charge a specific amount of tax due from Defendant Springer for calendar year 2005. The proof need not show the exact amount of the tax due for that year.

And, again, in the official version, I will delete the word "additional" there.

The government is required to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the tax due was substantial.

I'll make the same correction, deleting the word "additional."

Again, an affirmative act to evade or defeat payment of taxes is a positive act of commission designed to mislead or conceal.

For purposes of Count 4, the affirmative acts alleged to have been committed by Defendant Springer, as charged in the indictment, are: Directing individuals to make checks payable to Bondage Breakers Ministry and using a check-cashing business to cash checks.

The affirmative acts by Defendants Springer and Stilley, as charged in the indictment, are: Using Defendant Stilley's IOLTA account; using Defendant Stilley's credit card to pay Defendant Springer's personal expenses; using cashier's checks, money orders, cash, and other means of payment to avoid usual records and to conceal income; making false statements to agents

and employees of the Internal Revenue Service; and otherwise concealing and attempting to conceal from all proper officers of the United States of America Defendant Springer's true and correct income.

In addition to being charged as a principal,

Defendant Stilley is charged as an aider and abetter in

Count 4.

Again, you are instructed that, in addition to the other elements described in this instruction, proof of proper venue is also required before you may find a defendant guilty of the crime charged in Count 4. I will instruct you later regarding proof of venue.

I will now instruct you on the elements of aiding and abetting.

With respect to aiding and abetting, you are instructed that Section 2(a) of Title 18 of the United States Code provides that, "Whoever commits an offense against the United States or aids, abets, counsels, commands, induces, or procures its commission is punishable as a principal."

As previously stated, Counts 3 and 4 of the indictment charge Defendant Stilley with violations of this statute, 18 United States Code, Section 2. This law makes it a crime to intentionally help someone else commit a crime.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

To find Defendant Stilley guilty of the tax evasion charged in Count 3 or Count 4 as an aider and abetter, you must be convinced that the government has proved each of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt: First, that Defendant Springer committed the tax evasion crime charged in the indictment in Count 3 or in Count 4, respectively; and, second, that Defendant Stilley intentionally associated himself in some way with that crime and intentionally participated in it as he would in something he wished to bring about which requires proof that Defendant Stilley consciously shared Defendant Springer's knowledge of the underlying criminal act of the tax evasion charged and that Defendant Stillev intended to help Defendant Springer commit that crime. An aider and abetter need not perform the underlying criminal act, be present when it is performed, or be aware of the details of its commission to be quilty of aiding and abetting, but a general suspicion that an unlawful act may occur or that something criminal is happening is not enough. Mere presence at the scene of a crime and knowledge that a crime is being committed are also not sufficient to establish aiding and abetting. Again, in addition to the elements of aiding and

abetting described in this instruction, proof of venue is

required in order to find a defendant quilty of a crime

by aiding and abetting.

I will instruct you later regarding proof of venue.

Counts 5 and 6 of the indictment charge Defendant Springer only with a violation of Section 7203 of Title 26 of the United States Code.

Section 7203 provides, in pertinent part, that, "Any person required under this title to pay any estimated tax or tax or required by this title or by regulations made under authority thereof to make a return, keep any records, or supply any information, who willfully fails to pay such estimated tax or tax, make such return, keep such records, or supply such information at the time or times required by law or regulations shall be guilty of an offense against the United States."

As just stated, Defendant Springer is charged in Counts 5 and 6 with violations of Title 26, United States Code, Section 7203. This law makes it a crime for anyone to willfully fail to make and file an income tax return.

In Count 5, the indictment charges that during the calendar year 2002, Defendant Springer had and received gross income in excess of \$7,700.

The indictment further charges that by reason of such gross income Defendant Springer was required by law, following the close of the calendar year 2002 and on or before April 15, 2003, to make an income tax return to

2.5

the Internal Revenue Service stating specifically the items of his gross income and any deductions and credits to which he was entitled.

The indictment further charges that well-knowing and believing all of the foregoing Defendant Springer did willfully fail on or about April 15, 2003, in the Northern District of Oklahoma and elsewhere, to make and file an income tax return.

In Count 6, the indictment charges that during the calendar year 2004, Defendant Springer had and received gross income in excess of \$15,900. The indictment further charges that, by reason of such gross income, Defendant Springer was required by law, following the close of the calendar year 2004 and on or before April 15, 2005, to make an income tax return to the Internal Revenue Service stating specifically the items of his gross income and any deductions and credits to which he was entitled.

The indictment further charges that well-knowing and believing all of the foregoing, Defendant Springer did willfully fail on or about April 15, 2005, in the Northern District of Oklahoma and elsewhere to make and file an income tax return.

Counts 5 and 6, elements of the offense.

To find Defendant Springer guilty of the crime

charged in Count 5 or Count 6, you must be convinced that the government has proved each of the following elements 2 3 beyond a reasonable doubt: First, that Defendant Springer was required by law 4 5 to file a tax return concerning his income for the taxable years ending December 31, 2002, for purposes of 6 Count 5 or December 31, 2004, for purposes of Count 6; 7 Second, that Defendant Springer failed to file such 8 9 a return at the time required by law; And, third, that in failing to file the tax return, 10 Defendant Springer acted willfully, that is, with a 11 voluntary intent to violate a known legal duty. 12 For the crime of willful failure to file a tax 13 return, the government it not required to show that a tax 14 is due and owing from Defendant Springer, nor is the 15 16 government required to prove an intent to evade or defeat any taxes. 17 Again, in addition to the elements described in this 18 19 instruction, proof of proper venue is also required before you may find a defendant guilty of the crimes 20 charged in Counts 5 or 6. 21 I will instruct you next regarding proof of venue. 22 I will now give you instructions regarding proof of 23 24 venue.

Tracy Washbourne, RDR, CRR
United States Court Reporter
U.S. Courthouse, 200 N.W. 4th St.
Oklahoma City, OK 73102 * 405.609.5505

In addition to the other elements of each crime

25